

**REMARKS:****Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 2 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have cancelled claim 2 and incorporated the details of claim 2 into claim 1 so the rejection is moot. However, the amendment to claim 1 has corrected the language purported to be indefinite by adding the feature that the spaced apart layers are configured to facilitate articulation therebetween.

**Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 3-10, 15-17 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Becker et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,652,568. In response applicant has amended claims 1, 15 and 16 to incorporate the features of claim 2 which the Examiner indicates would be allowable.

**Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 11-14 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,652,568. However, these claims depend from claim 1 which is believed to be patentable.

**Conclusions**

Applicant believes that the pending claims define patentable subject matter and respectfully request reconsideration and an early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Edward J. Lynch  
Registration No. 24,422  
Attorney for Applicants

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
One Market  
Spear Tower, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 371-2200  
Facsimile: (415) 371-2201  
Direct Dial: (415) 371-2267